

HSC file
DoE
22 January 1976

Members of the Review Staff thought it might be of interest and edification to share with a few senior officers some of the comments received in connection with the Agency's review of the HSC draft report.

The attached introductory remarks from some of the papers are forwarded for your information and approbation. While members of the Review Staff uttered some views more traditional and earthy, they were not recorded so are not attached.

S. D. Breckinridge

Attachment: a/s

Distribution:

DDO
DDI
DDA
DDS&T
✓ D/DCI/NIO
D/DCI/IC
IG
OGC
COMPT.
SC/DCI
Exec.Secy.

1. The following comments on the first 206 pages of the HSC report are limited for the most part to observations regarding the factual accuracy of statements contained in the report or parts of the report that should be objected to on grounds of security. Given the extreme shrillness of the report and its obvious bias, I see no way of attempting to insert any materials that would provide more balance to the report. In fact, I believe the tilt and the tone of the report are so extreme that we would be better off letting it stand as it is so that it will be its own best witness against itself. Given the track record of this particular investigatory body, I also see little hope that any of our suggestions would be accepted.

1. The draft is a sophomoric attempt to present the picture of the Intelligence Community and its components -- their authorities, their relationships, their budgets and their restraints under command, control and review. The draft reflects no appreciation for the complexity of intelligence operations and the programming of intelligence resources. There are problems and weaknesses in these areas to be addressed, but the draft fails to highlight these issues. Rather, it broadcasts a wholesale castigation of the entire process based on a few fragmentary bits of information, some of which are misinterpretations of fact.

1. Attached are [REDACTED] comments listed under the headings: Security, Factual Errors, and Misinterpretations.
2. What we have not listed is the fact that we consider the report repugnant, in error, and basically a lie to the American people. It is not a true representation of intelligence activities in the United States, nor does it reflect the findings of the House Select Committee in all their totality. The Committee has done a tremendous disservice to the intelligence organizations as well as the American people by this report which is a gross misrepresentation, at best, of intelligence.
3. Rather than to attempt to refute this highly biased report specifically, or to attempt to correct factually the erroneous statements therein made, thus giving credence to the nonsense that we do not object to, we recommend that consideration be given to addressing the report from a security standpoint alone deleting names or events which would be compromising, and simply confine ourselves to that aspect without attempting to comment on the innuendos, false conclusions, and other misrepresentations.

Aside from stating that this is slanted, generally slanderous, misleading and petty, I will make a few specific comments. Very little of the substance relates to matters primarily the concern of this Office and therefore in most cases I will not comment on obvious points that will be covered by other offices. Being cynical and disillusioned, my response to this nasty paper is that there is not much we can say to which the Committee will pay any attention. Therefore perhaps we should use as our guide the classic adage "Don't get in a spraying contest with a skunk."